

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 191-202 and 205-216 were pending in the Application. Claims 191 and 205 were amended. Claims 191-202 and 205-216 are now pending in the application.

The amendment of claim 191 was made according to the Examiner's instructions in order to overcome the objection. The amendment of claim 205 was further made in order to conform with the Examiner's instructions regarding claim 191.

Mention in the specification (page 3, line 6) of the related U.S. Patent 6,629,809 was made according the Examiner's requirement.

The insertion on page 25, between lines 12 and 14 of the specification finds support in page 13, lines 25-28, page 51, lines 5-9, and claim 195, among other places.

The addition of Figure 20C finds support in page 13, lines 25-28, page 51, lines 5-9, claim 195, and Figure 20A, among other places.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

The disclosure was objected to because of the absence of the related U.S. Patent 6,629,809 from the specification.

The specification was amended to include this related patent in page 3, line 6 of the specification.

Therefore Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 191 was objected to because the word --the-- should be inserted before "left section" in line 9.

This correction as well as a respective correction in claim 205 were performed, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

### ***Drawings***

The Drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because the feature of snapping segments connected to the upper segment of claim 195 was not demonstrated by a Figure.

Figure 20C is hereby enclosed on an Additional Sheet. Figure 20C demonstrates the feature of snapping segments connected to the upper segment of claim 195. Since it finds support in page 13, lines 25-28, page 51, lines 5-9, claim 195, and Figure 20A, among other places, no new matter is entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The comments of the Examiner are acknowledged.

Claims 191, 192, 195-198, 201, 202, 205, 206, 209-212, 215 and 216 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Parkin (U. S. Patent No. 3,426,817).

Applicant respectfully traverses the position of the Office Action. The claims of the present invention, have immense differences when compared to what Parkin (U. S. Patent No. 3,426,817) discloses.

The major and **critical** difference is that according to the present invention the snapping segments are connected to the upper or lower section, and the left and right sections are connected to the bottom, while in the case of Parkin both the “first resilient pair 3, 4” (column 2, lines 27-32) and the “second pair of resilient arms 7, 8” extend integrally from the “base 1” (column 2, lines 33-40).

In the case of Parkin’ s device, if the “first pair of resilient arms 3, 4” (column 2, lines 27-32) were not extending integrally from the “base 1”, but from the “end portions 9, 10” of the “second pair of resilient arms 7, 8” the operation of Parkin’s device would be impossible, since an operator would not be able to apply and later release manual, or any other kind of pressure, in order to flex the “second pair of resilient arms 7, 8” in a manner to flex and align the “apertures 9a and 10a” with the “aperture 2” of the “nut means”, and finally cause the “flared lips 11, 12” to be into “locking engagement” (column 2, line 61 to column 3, line 2).

Further, if the snapping segments of the present invention were connected to the bottom section, the fastener of the present invention would become inoperable, since the snapping segments would not flex in the proper position.

In other words, for the device of Parkin to be operable, it is **absolutely critical** that the “first pair of resilient arms 3, 4” (column 2, lines 27-32) have to have their fulcrum **away** from the “end portions 9, 10” of the “second pair of resilient arms 7, 8”, while for the fastener of the present invention to be operable, it is **absolutely critical** that at least one of the snapping segments has its fulcrum **on** a respective upper or lower free ended section.

Thus, Parkin’ s disclosure not only does not obviate the connection of the snapping segments to the upper or lower section of the present invention, but **definitely leads away** from such configuration.

Therefore, Applicant earnestly believes that claims 191, 192, 195-198, 201, 202, 205, 206, 209-212, 215 and 216 are not obviated under 35 USC § 103(a) over Parkin (U. S. Patent No. 3,426,817), and respectfully requests removal of the rejection.

Claims 193, 194, 199, 200, 207, 208, 213, and 214 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Parkin as above and further in view of Tinnermann (RE 21,769).

Since claims 193, 194, 199, 200, 207, 208, 213, and 214 contain directly or indirectly all limitations of either claim 191 or claim 205, and since Applicant earnestly believes that he has demonstrated the patentability of claims 191 and 295, Applicant also earnestly believes that claims 193, 194, 199, 200, 207, 208, 213, and 214 are also patentable over and in view of the above references, and any further discussion would be moot.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claims 193, 194, 199, 200, 207, 208, 213, and 214.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant acknowledges the comments of the Examiner.